



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/535,713	02/02/2006	Philip Stephen Fullam	1111-29	7486
24106	7590	12/15/2009	EXAMINER	
EGBERT LAW OFFICES 412 MAIN STREET, 7TH FLOOR HOUSTON, TX 77002			HAYES, KRISTEN C	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3643	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/15/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/535,713

Applicant(s)

FULLAM ET AL.

Examiner

KRISTEN C. HAYES

Art Unit

3643

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 August 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 21-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 21-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SI/200)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 21, 25 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kolehmainen GB 2001434 in view of Nelson et al. US 2005/0217587.
3. Regarding claim 21, Kolehmainen discloses a method of testing milk from a mammal for a presence of an infection in the mammal, the method comprising introducing a liquid sample (Kolehmainen, page 1: line 65) of the milk and a reagent (Kolehmainen, page 1: lines 69-70, lines 124-128) into a reaction chamber (6), said reagent having a light-amplifying compound therein; reacting said light-amplifying compound with a substance produced by cells of the in response to the infection (Kolehmainen, page 1: lines 69-81) prior to the liquid sample being introduced into the reaction chamber (Kolehmainen, page 1: lines 64-74); immediately after introducing the liquid sample and reagent into the reaction chamber, activating a light detector (Kolehmainen, page 1: lines 77-78). Not disclosed is the milk being within a milk line of an automated milking system or the reaction chamber being within the milk line. Nelson et al. teach an in situ system for detecting disease in the udder of animals. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to place the system of Kolehmainen in situ with a milking line, as taught by Nelson et al., as to avoid any delay in detecting disease and to further automate the system.

Art Unit: 3643

4. Regarding claim 25, Kolehmainen in view of Nelson further discloses measuring the intensity for a maximum of five minutes after the step of introducing (Kolehmainen, page 1: lines 109-112).

5. Regarding claim 29, Kolehmainen discloses a method of testing milk from a mammal for a presence of an infection in the mammal, the method comprising introducing a liquid sample of the milk (Kolehmainen, page 1: line 65) and a reagent (Kolehmainen, page 1: lines 69-70, 124-128) into a reaction chamber (6), said reagent having a light-amplifying compound therein; reacting said light-amplifying compound with a substance produced by cells of the mammal in response to the infection, the substance being produced before the step of introducing the sample and the reagent (if the milk was infected, the cells would inherently produce the substance, as indicated by the applicant on page 3 lines 28-29 of the instant specification); and immediately after introducing the liquid sample and reagent into the reaction chamber, activating a light detector (Kolehmainen, page 1: lines 77-78). Not disclosed is the milk being within a milk line of an automated milking system or the reaction chamber being within the milk line. Nelson et al. teach an in situ system for detecting disease in the udder of animals. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to place the system of Kolehmainen in situ with a milking line, as taught by Nelson et al., as to avoid any delay in detecting disease and to further automate the system.

6. Claims 22-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kolehmainen GB 2001434 in view of in view of Nelson et al. US 2005/0217587 as applied to claims 21, 25 and 29 above; and in further view of Knight EP 0489602.

7. Regarding claims 22 and 23, Kolehmainen in view of Nelson et al. discloses the device of claim 21. Not disclosed is the substance being produced by phagocytic leukocytes. Knight

Art Unit: 3643

teaches the substance being produced by phagocytic leukocytes when they phagocytose bacteria. Knight discloses an alternative substance that is responsive to light and can be used to determine infection. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to make the substance of Kolehmainen as modified by Nelson et al. phagocytic leukocytes when they phagocytose bacteria, as phagocytic leukocytes when they phagocytose bacteria could provide a more accurate reading.

8. Regarding claim 24, Kolehmainen in view of Nelson et al. and Knight further discloses the light-amplifying compound reacting with reactive oxygen so as to emit light (Kolehmainen, page 1: line 128).

9. Claims 26-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kolehmainen GB 2001434 in view of in view of Nelson et al. US 2005/0217587 as applied to claims 21, 25 and 29 above; and in further view of Aerojet GB 1315467.

10. Regarding claim 26, Kolehmainen in view of Nelson et al. further discloses a fluid-tight and light-tight (7, 11) reaction chamber of variable capacity (10). Not disclosed are a first inlet port connected to the milk line, a second inlet port connected to a supply of reagent or increasing the capacity of the reaction chamber so as to draw the milk and reagent into the reaction chamber. Aerojet further discloses connecting a first inlet port (12) of a generally fluid and light tight reaction chamber (26) of variable capacity to a milk sample (11), connecting a second inlet port (14) of the reaction chamber to a supply (13) of reagent and increasing capacity of the chamber (by way of 23) (Aerojet, page 3: lines 5-9) in order to draw milk and reagent into the chamber. Not disclosed is the first inlet port being connected to the milk line in an automated milking system. However, Aerojet discloses maintaining a continuous flow within the system between the sensor and samples (Aerojet, page 3: lines 10-14). It would have been

Art Unit: 3643

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to connect a first inlet port of the reacting chamber of Kolehmainen as modified by Nelson et al. to a milk line, connect a second inlet port to a supply of reagent and draw the milk and reagent into the reaction chamber so as to further automate the system, and to connect the first inlet port of Aerojet to a milk line in an automated milking system (such as suggested by Nelson et al.) so to provide continuous flow to the sensor, as suggested by Aerojet.

11. Regarding claim 27, Kolehmainen in view of Nelson et al. and Aerojet discloses the device of claim 26. Aerojet further discloses controlling an electrically-actuated operating valve (16) to regulate proportion of reagent and sample drawn into the reaction chamber (Aerojet, page 1: lines 79-85). Not disclosed is a plurality of valves with the valves provided in inlet ports. A plurality of valves, with a valve in each inlet port would provide the predictable result of allowing the amount of sample or reagent to be controlled individually, with the user able to control the ratio of milk to sample. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to further modify the device Kolehmainen in view of Nelson et al. with electrically-actuated operating valves so as to accurately control the amount of sample and reagent feed into the reaction chamber and to modify the device of Aerojet so that there was a plurality of valves, with a valve in each inlet port, as discussed above.

12. Regarding claim 28, Kolehmainen in view of Nelson et al. and Aerojet further discloses moving a piston (Kolehmainen, (10)) in the reaction chamber.

Response to Arguments

13. Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

14. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to KRISTEN C. HAYES whose telephone number is (571)270-3093. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, 7:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Peter Poon can be reached on (571)272-6891. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3643

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

KCH
11 December 2009

/Rob Swiatek/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3643
11 December 2009